

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, and 4-54 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, 39-40, 42, and 52-53 have been amended and claims 3 and 20 have been canceled.

Claims 1-39 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. The Examiner asserts that the claims are not directed to statutory subject matter. The claims, as amended, are directed to a computer-implemented, computerized or electronic method and system for a consumer to obtain a price quote. As the claims are now directed to a technologically implemented method, the invention cannot be carried out solely in the mind of the user as the Examiner asserts. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 15-17, 19-22, 26-34 and 37-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,397,197 to Gindlesperger. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 relating to a computer-implemented method of obtaining a price quote recites, *inter alia*, "submitting a request for a quote by the consumer to a staging area, wherein said quote includes at least one product specification; [and] selecting, by said customer, from a carrier list, at least one carrier."

Independent claim 39 relates to an electronic method for brokering a transaction and recites, *inter alia*, "receiving a selection made by said customer, from a carrier list, of at least two carriers; receiving at least one price quote from a first selected carrier of said product; receiving a second quote from a selected second carrier of said product; and posting said request and said price quotes to a staging area."

Independent claim 19 relates to an “electronic method for at least two carriers, selected by a customer from a carrier list, to provide a price quote for a product in response to a request for said quote from said consumer.”

Independent claim 42 relates to a system for conducting an on-line auction and recites, *inter alia*, “an electronic staging area linked to said broker interface, wherein said staging area displays requests for price quotes on products submitted by consumers, forwards requests for price quotes to one or more carriers selected by said customer and displays responses to said requests by said one or more carriers of said products.”

Gindlesperger is directed to a method for obtaining a product bid from a plurality of vendors. In Gindlesperger, a pool of vendors, which have been previously entered by the customer, are stored by the server. The Gindlesperger system, when it receives a request for a bid, checks the vendor pool to determine whether all of the vendors provide the service requested by the customer. After the capability check is complete, the Gindlesperger system automatically forwards the quote to all capable vendors in the customer’s vendor list. Gindlesperger does not, however, allow the customer to select the vendors to receive a price quote for each transaction. Accordingly, Gindlesperger does not teach “selecting, by said customer, from a carrier list, at least one carrier,” as recited in claim 1, or “receiving a selection made by said customer, from a carrier list, of at least two carriers” as recited in claim 39. Nor does Gindlesperger teach “[a]n electronic method for at least two carriers, selected by a customer from a carrier list, to provide a price quote for a product in response to a request for said quote from said consumer” as recited by claim 19. Similarly, Gindlesperger does not teach forwarding the request for price quote to vendors selected to provide the price quote as recited in independent claim 42. Thereby,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 19, 39 and 42 and respective dependent claims 2, 4-18, 21-38, 40-41 and 43-51.

Claims 8, 9, 18, 23-25 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,397,197 to Gindlesperger in view of U.S. Patent 5,905,975 to Ausubel. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Amended independent claim 52 recites, *inter alia*, "pre-registering at least one customer who is interested in obtaining a competitive price quote on a product; pre-registering at least two carriers of said product; establishing a time for said auction; [and] having said at least one customer submit a request for a price quote and select at least two carriers from said pre-registered carriers to bid on said quote."

As previously noted, Gindlesperger relates to forwarding quote request information to vendors and receiving price quotes from the vendors. However, Gindlesperger fails to provide an online auction as recited in independent claim 52. Further, Gindlesperger fails to disclose "having said at least one customer submit a request for a price quote and select at least two carriers from said pre-registered carriers to bid on said quote," as recited in independent claim 52. Ausubel relates to a computer implemented method and apparatus for auctions in which sellers post items for sale and at least one buyer bids on each posted item. However, Ausubel fails to teach a system in which a buyer wishes to obtain a price quote for the provision of a product. Thereby, the combination of Ausubel and Gindlesperger fails to create the claimed invention. Additionally, it would not have been obvious to combine the price quoting system of Gindlesperger with the seller's auction of Ausubel. Further, Ausubel and Gindlesperger, either alone or in combination, fail to teach "having said at least one customer submit a request for a price quote and select at least two carriers from said

pre-registered carriers to bid on said quote,” as recited in independent claim 52.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 52.

Claims 8, 9 and 18 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Similarly, claims 23-25 depend from independent claim 19 and therefore are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 13-14, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,397,197 to Gindlesperger in view of U.S. Patent 6,282,521 to Howorka. Howorka does not make up for the inadequacies of Gindlesperger identified above. Specifically, Howorka relates to a computer trading system. Howorka, however, does not teach “selecting, by said customer, from a carrier list, at least one carrier” as recited in claim 1, “[a]n electronic method for at least two carriers, selected by a customer from a carrier list, to provide a price quote for a product in response to a request for said quote from said consumer” as recited by claim 19. Claims 13-14 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Claims 35-36 depend from independent claim 19 and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,397,197 to Gindlesperger and U.S. Patent 5,905,975 to Ausubel, further in view of U.S. Patent 5,806,042 to Kelly. Claim 53 recites, *inter alia*, “[a]n electronic method for competitively quoting a rate of return for premiums deposited in a bank-owned life insurance (BOLI) policy.”

Gindlesperger, Ausubel and Kelly, either alone or in combination, fail to teach “[a]n electronic method for competitively quoting a rate of return for premiums deposited in a bank-owned life insurance (BOLI) policy.” As previously noted,

Gindlesperger relates to forwarding quote request information to vendors and receiving price quotes from the vendors and Ausubel relates to a computer implemented method and apparatus for auctions in which sellers post items for sale and at least one buyer bids on each posted item. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to combine a seller's auction and a price quote system. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Kelly relates to a system for designing and implementing BOLI; however, Kelly does not relate to a price quote system or an electronic auction. The combination of Gindlesperger, Ausubel and Kelly would not create the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,397,197 to Gindlesperger and U.S. Patent 5,806,042 to Kelly. Claim 54 recites, *inter alia*, "[a]n electronic system useful in conducting an on-line auction for rates-of-return on funds deposited in bank-owned life insurance (BOLI)."

Gindlesperger or Kelly, either alone or in combination, fail to teach "[a]n electronic system useful in conducting an on-line auction for rates-of-return on funds deposited in bank-owned life insurance (BOLI)." As previously noted, Gindlesperger relates to forwarding quote request information to vendors and fails to teach an online auction and more specifically an online auction for BOLI. Kelly does not make up the inadequacies of Gindlesperger. While Kelly relates to a system for designing and implementing BOLI, however, Kelly does not relate to price quote system or an electronic auction. It should be noted that the present invention is not limited to BOLI, but can cover other types of products. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Thereby, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine a system for designing and implementing a BOLI plan with a price quote system. Furthermore, the combination of Gindlesperger and Kelly would

not create the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jon D. Grossman

Registration No.: 32,699

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant